

**Appl. No. 09/751,788
Amdt. dated December 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 9, 2005**

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office action dated September 9, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over applicants' alleged admission of prior art (AAPA) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,799). With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 13, 14, and 16 and cancel claims 2, 12, and 15.

Applicants amend claim 1 to require "said static random access memory is assigned addresses overlaying at least a portion of the addresses assigned to said initialization memory." A similar version of this limitation was previously in dependent claim 2, now canceled. With regard to previous claim 2, the Examiner stated that "the SRAM is obviously assigned address overlaying a portion of the address space assigned to the initialization memory, otherwise the SRAM could not be cooperated with the initialization memory to execute the codes stored in initialization memory." Office action, page 3. The Examiner's point seems to be that, for the structure at hand to function correctly, the address overlay feature of claim 2 necessarily must be implemented, and therefore the Examiner's position is that the invention of claim 2 is obvious.


The Examiner, however, has not explained why the Examiner believes there to be no alternative to the invention of claim 2. Applicants believe that there is at least one alternative to the invention of claim 2. For example, the addresses of the static random access memory can be assigned to an address range other than addresses of the initialization memory. However, doing so would involve additional decode logic and possibly other logic thereby complicating the design relative to the invention of amended claim 1. At least for the reason that there is at least one alternative to the implementation of claim 1, the Examiner's analysis is flawed and thus claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance. The same or similar amendments have been made to independent claims 6, 9, and 14 and thus those claims and their associated dependent claims are allowable as well.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees

Appl. No. 09/751,788
Amdt. dated December 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 9, 2005

are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400